

Pl



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/353,950	07/15/1999	THEODORE JACK LONDON SHRADER	AT9-99-148	4357

35525 7590 03/01/2004

DUKE W. YEE
CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, L.L.P.
P.O. BOX 802334
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

HUA, LY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/353,950

Applicant(s)

SHRADER

Examiner

Ly V. Hua

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. With regard to claim 1:

- i. In the clause reciting the “displaying” step:

- (1) The letter “w” in the phrase “w web browser” appears to be of typing error.

- (2) The phrase “the web browser” lacks antecedent basis.

- ii. It appears that the step of having and the step of displaying have no logical unity. Notice that a leading from one step to the other is not clear.

iv. The body of the claim does not support the preamble.

(1) The preamble is set forth to claim a method for displaying “web browser authentication data,”

(a) but the body of the claim does not recite:

(i) any step for displaying the “web browser authentication data” and/or

(ii) any step that leads to the displaying of the “web browser authentication data”

(2) Notice that the “given first information” is for indicating that a web browser has done a sending function, rather than is the “web browser authentication data” itself, unless the “given first information” is the “web browser authentication data”.

(3) If the “given first information” is the “web browser authentication data”, then the technical aspect of the method is not clear.

b. With regard to claims 2-4:

i. It is not clear how displaying each of the type of information (such as the user-id, the logon icon indicating that the user has executed a logon to the given realm or the information identifying the realm) can possibly indicate that the web browser has sent a user-id and its accompanying password to the server.

c. With regard to claims 5 and 6:

Art Unit: 2135

- i. These claims depend on claim 1 and thus inherit the problems of indefiniteness therefrom.
- d. With regard to claim 7 (and thus also claim 10 which depends on it):
 - i. Claim 7 appears to be confusing in that it claims that a logoff menu entry is displayed responsive to selecting a logon icon. It is expected that when selecting a logon icon a logon menu (rather than a logoff menu) would be displayed.
- e. With regard to claim 10:
 - i. The phrase “the ... second given information” lacks antecedent basis.
- f. With regard to claim 8:
 - i. It is not clear whether this claim 8 ends at the period in line 24.
 - ii. It is not clear whether the lines after line 24 should be read with claim 8.
 - iii. The phrase “the web browser” (first occurrence) lacks antecedent basis.
 - iv. It is not clear whether the prepositional phrase “on a web browser frame” is used:
 - (1) to indicate where the given first information is displayed or
 - (2) for indicating where the given first information come from.
 - v. It is not clear whether the prepositional phrase “on the web browser frame” is used:
 - (1) to indicate where the given second information is displayed or

- (2) for indicating where the given second information is coming from.
- vi. From where the given first information is taken is not clear. How the given first information emerges is not clear. The source of the given first information is not clear.
- vii. It appears that the step of having and the step of displaying given first information have no logical unity. Notice that a leading from one step to the other is not clear.
- viii. It appears that the step of displaying a new logon panel and the step of displaying given second information have no logical unity. Notice that a leading from one step to the other is not clear.
- ix. The body of the claim does not support the preamble.
 - (1) The preamble is set forth to claim a method for displaying “web browser authentication data,
 - (2) but the body of the claim does not recite:
 - (a) any step wherein the “web browser authentication data” is displayed and/or
 - (b) any step that lead to the displaying of the “web browser authentication data”
 - (3) Notice that the “given first information” is for indicating that a web browser has done a sending function, rather than is the “web browser authentication data” itself.
 - (4) Notice also that the “given second information” is for indicating that a web browser has done a sending function, rather than is the

“web browser authentication data” itself.

g. With regard to claim 9:

- i. This claim depends on claim 1 and thus inherits the problems of indefiniteness therefrom.

h. With regard to claim 11:

- i. This claim has drafted similar to claim 8 and thus has the same problems indefiniteness as those therein, and thus is also rejected with the same rationale.

3.

a. With regard to claims 12-14:

- i. These claims depend on claim 1 and thus inherit the problems of indefiniteness therefrom.

b. With regard to claim 15:

- i. Claim 15 appears to be incomplete since:
 - (1) it is not ended with a period and
 - (2) the phrase “the logon icon” is dangling by itself.
- ii. The phrase “the web browser” lacks antecedent basis.
- iii. It is not clear whether the prepositional phrase “on a web browser frame” is used:

Art Unit: 2135

- (1) to indicate where a user-id is displayed or
 - (2) for indicating where the given first information come from.
 - iv. From where the user-id is taken is not clear. How the user-id emerges is not clear. The source of the user-id is not clear.
 - v. It appears that the means for displaying a user-id and the means for displaying a logon icon have no logical unity. Notice that a cooperative relationship between the two means is not clear.
 - vi. The body of the claim does not support the preamble.
 - (1) The preamble is set forth to claim a method for displaying “web browser authentication data,” but the body of the claim does not recite:
 - (a) any step wherein the “web browser authentication data” is displayed and/or
 - (b) any step that lead to the displaying of the “web browser authentication data.”
 - (2) Notice that the “user-id” is for indicating that a web browser has done a sending function, rather than is the “web browser authentication data” itself.
- c. With regard to claim 16:
 - i. In the clause reciting the user-id displaying means:
 - (1) It is not clear as to how a user-id (which is just an identification code) can possibly indicate that a web browser has sent a user-id

Art Unit: 2135

and its accompanying password to a server.

ii. In the clause reciting the logon icon displaying means:

- (1) It is not clear as to how a logon icon (which is just an icon) can possibly indicate that the user has logged onto a given realm.

d. With regard to claim 17:

i. In the clause reciting the “having” step:

- (1) It is not clear who or what has the user does the connection.
- (2) The object that is connected by the user to the targeted domain and path is not clear (perhaps the object is missing from the clause).
- (3) It is not clear how a user (being a person) can possibly be connected to a domain/path that is on a server.

ii. In the clause reciting the “displaying” step:

- (1) The phrase “the web browser” lacks antecedent basis.
- (2) The usage of prepositional phrase “on a web browser frame” is confusing:
 - (a) It is not clear whether the prepositional phrase “on a web browser frame” is used:
 - (i) to indicate where the given first information is displayed or

Art Unit: 2135

- (ii) for indicating where the given first information come from.
 - (b) Notice that:
 - (i) if the phrase is used to describe where the information is displayed, then from where the given first information is taken is not clear, and
 - (ii) if the phrase is used to describe where the information is from, then it is not clear as to where the information is displayed by the displaying step.
- (3) How the given first information emerges is not clear. The source of the given first information is not clear.
- iii. It appears that the two steps recited in this claim have no logical unity. Notice that a leading from one step to the other is not clear.
- iv. Who or what that which has the user and/or displaying is not clear.
- v. The body of the claim does not support the preamble.
 - (1) The preamble is set forth to claim a method for displaying “web browser cookie data”, but the body of the claim does not recite:
 - (a) any step wherein the “web browser cookie data” is displayed and/or
 - (b) any step that lead to the displaying of the “web browser

Art Unit: 2135

cookie data.”

- (2) Notice that the “given first information” is for indicating that a web browser has done a sending function, rather than is the “web browser cookie data” itself.

(3)

e. With regard to claims 18-24:

- i. These claims depend on claim 17 and thus inherit the problem of indefiniteness therefrom.
- ii. The applicant is to review claims 18-24 for other 35 USC 112 second paragraph problems.

f. With regard to claim 25:

- i. In the clause reciting the “determining” step:
 - (1) The purpose for which whether the URL has an entry in a table is determined is not clear.
 - (a) Notice that, the result of the determination (if any) is not being used to affect the usage of the data.
 - (2) The term “an entry” is vague and indefinite (i.e., what is meant by “an entry” is not clear).
 - (3) An entity (i.e., who or what) that does the determination is not clear.
 - (4) The usage of the clause “the URL has an entry in a table” is confusing.

- (a) Notice that it is not clear whether the clause should be interpreted as:
 - (i) the URL has an entry, which entry is not the URL and is in a table; or
 - (ii) the URL (a subject) has (a verb, e.g., has put/placed) an entry (a direct object).
 - ii. In the clause reciting the “retrieving” step:
 - (1) The claim recites a condition “if the entry is marked in the table as unblocked” is used, but there is not any step wherein the condition is determined.
 - iii. The body of the claim does not support the preamble.
 - (1) Notice that the preamble is set forth to claim “a method for using cookie data”, but the body of the claim does not have step(s) reciting the usage of the cookie data.
 - (2) It is not clear as to how the recited steps result in cookie data being used.
 - iv. It appears that the applicant has left a gap between a result of the determination step and the condition on which cookie data can be retrieve. This gap make the claim appears confusing. The applicant is to resolve this problem.
- g. With regard to claims 26-32:
 - i. In claim 26, the purpose for which the cookie icon is displayed is not

clear. How this displaying step contributes to the effect of using the cookie data is not clear.

ii. These claims do not further limits their parent claim 25.

(1) The steps in these claims do not support the using of the cookie of the method set forth in claim 25, since the steps in these claims are for providing new cookie data to a browser and thus making it available within the client computer where the browser resides, rather than using it.

h. With regard to claims 38-42:

i. These claims have the same problems of indefiniteness as those in claims 25-32.

i. With regard to claim 33:

i. The drafting of the claim is replete with unclear meaning that it is not clear what the claimed invention is:

(1) In the clause reciting the means which is responsive to the user:

(a) The clause “means responsive to a user connecting to a targeted domain and path on a server” is confusing:

(i) With regard to the phrase “connecting to a target domain and path”:

1) It is not clear as to whether this modifier phrase is used to modify the user or the

means.

a) If this phrase is to modify the user,
then either:

i) an object being connected by
the user to the targeted
domain and path is missing
or

ii) it is not clear how the user
(being a person) can possibly
be connected to electronic
domain and path.

b) if this phrase is to modify the means,
then

i) it is not clear why the
applicant would recited such
connection when instruction
code/means in a computer-
readable medium for a
network node is inherently
connected in one way or
another directly and/or
indirectly to each and every

elements in the network – (it appears that this phrase only introduces confusion to the claim);

(ii) With regard to the “on a server”:

1) It is not clear as to whether this modifier phrase is used to modify:

- a) the means or
- b) the user or
- c) the combination of a targeted domain and path or
- d) just the path.

(b) It is not clear whether the prepositional phrase “for the targeted domain and path” is used as a modifier phrase to modify:

- (i) the server or
- (ii) the cookie.

(2) In the clause reciting the means which is operative in a current web browser session:

(a) It is not clear whether the phrase “for the targeted domain and path” is used as a modifier phrase to modify:

- (i) the server,
- (ii) the cookies or

(iii) the list.

(b) The relationship between sending the list of cookies to the server and the means for displaying that list of cookies is not clear.

- ii. It appear that claim 33 is confused by the series of prepositional phrases, each of which phrase is not clear as to what noun or verb that it is intended to describe – [The applicant is to avoid such confusion].
- iii. The claim use the term “first” for “a given first information”, but there is not any other second third, or fourth information. It is not clear whether a piece of information of another order is missing from the claim.

j. With regard to claim 38:

i. With regard to the clause reciting the determining means:

(1) The purpose for which whether the URL has an entry in a table is determined is not clear -- (i.e., how this determining function would contribute toward the using of the cookie is not clear).

(a) Notice that, the result of the determination (if any) is not being used to affect the usage of the data.

(2) The term “an entry” is vague and indefinite (i.e., what is meant by “an entry” is not clear).

(3) The usage of the clause “the URL has an entry in a table” is confusing.

(a) Notice that it is not clear whether the clause should be

interpreted as:

- (i) the URL has an entry, which entry is not the URL and is in a table; or
- (ii) the URL (a subject) has (a verb, e.g., has put/placed) an entry (a direct object).

ii. In the clause reciting the retrieving means:

- (1) The claim recites a condition “if the entry is marked in the table as unblocked” is used, but there is not any means whereby the condition is determined.

iii. The body of the claim does not support the preamble.

- (1) Notice that the preamble is set forth to claim “a computer program product ... for using cookie data”, but the body of the claim does not have means for using the cookie data.
- (2) It is not clear as to how the recited means bring use the cookie data.
- (3) It appears that the applicant has left a gap between a result (if any) of the determination made and the condition on which cookie data can be retrieve. This gap make the claim appears confusing. The applicant is to resolve this problem.

k. With regard to claims 39-42:

- i. These claims depend on claim 38 and thus inherit the problem of indefiniteness therefrom.

Art Unit: 2135

- ii. The applicant is to review claims 39-42 for other 35 USC 112 second paragraph problems.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 5. Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doeberl et al (6,237,033 hereinafter Doeberl) in view of Reiche (6,092,196).

- a. As per claim 1:

- i. Preliminary considerations:

- (1) With regard to the limitations in the clause reciting the “having” step:

- (a) Having a user log onto a realm supported on a server is not of applicant’s invention, but rather it is a function of

existing browser – (a user who uses a web browser such as Netscape or Microsoft Internet Explorer would have known that such web browser has, when the user accesses a secured/protected realm, him/her log onto a realm supported on a server) .

(b) It appears that the applicant used this clause to indicate when the displaying method occurs.

(2) With regard to the limitations in the clause reciting the “displaying” step:

(a) A web browser sending a user-id and its accompanying password to a server for a targeted URL is not of applicant’s invention, but rather it is one of the basic function of existing browsers.

(b) It appears that the applicant used the clause “the given first information indicating that the web browser sent a user-id and its accompanying password to the server for a targeted URL” to tell the meaning of what is that which is being displayed, rather than presenting that the feature in the clause has its novelty.

(i) With regard to the meaning of what is that which is being displayed, it is determined that:

1) displaying, of course, has some kind of meaning and the meaning of such (or rather

Art Unit: 2135

how one would perceive a meaning of a
display) is of one's determination.

ii. With the above preliminary considerations, claim 1 is left with:

(1) A method comprising a step of:

(a) displaying,

(i) on a web browser frame,

(ii) information

(iii) to indicate that

1) a web browser

a) has sent

i) authentication data (namely
user-id and its associated
password)

ii) to a server

(iv) after having a user logging onto a realm supported
by the server.

(2) Doeberl (6,237,033) teaches:

(a) displaying,

(i) on a web browser frame [since done by a browser
(col. 2, lines 1-13)]

(ii) given first information [i.e., cookie (col. 2, lines 1-
5)],

(iii) which displaying [of the cookie] indicates that

1) the browser

a) has sent

i) user-id and its accompanying password [since cookie at the browser is from web server and cookie is formed by the web server using authentication data (is as can be seen in Reiche (6,092,196) "cookie holding a user-ID and ... a password") came from the browser when the browser has the user log onto the server]

ii) to a server for a targeted URL, [such indication is taught by Doeberl in that Doeberl's displaying would not display if Doeberl's browser has not having the user logs on and thus has not send any authentication data

(in view of Reiche user-ID
and password) that is needed
to form the cookie];.

b. As per claims 2-4:

i. Claims 2-4 claim:

(1) 2-4. The method as described in Claim 1 wherein the given first information includes:

(a) 2. the user-id,

(b) 3. a logon icon indicating that the user has executed a logon to the given realm, or

(c) 4. information identifying the realm.

ii. Doeberl teaches that the given first information [cookie] displayed by his method includes:

(1) contents {col. 1, line 27-38; col. 5, lines 14-23, 50-65 [some of which contents can be set (col. 5 lines 62-67)]} such as:

(a) information identifying the realm [i.e., a domain, path (col. 1, lines 27-38)]; or

iii. Reiche teaches that cookie holds:

(1) contents such as:

(a) user-id. [col. 6, lines 38-57].

c. As per claim 5:

Art Unit: 2135

- i. 5. The method as described in Claim 1 further including the steps of:
 - (1) displaying,
 - (a) responsive to the user later attempting to navigate to a restricted URL,
 - (b) a new logon panel; and
 - (2) displaying,
 - (a) following logon,
 - (b) given second information
 - (i) on the web browser frame,
 - (ii) the given second information indicating
 - 1) that the web browser
 - a) sent
 - i) a new user-id and its accompanying password
 - ii) to the server for the restricted URL.
- ii. This claim has steps that are those of claim 1, however they occur at another time when the user makes another log-on to navigate to a restricted URL which requires User-ID and Password that are different from those required by other URL's.
- iii. Doeberl teaches that his browser displays cookie following user's logging on to navigate a URL.

Art Unit: 2135

d. As per claims 8 and 9:

- i. Since claims 8 and 9 have a combination of steps that are similar to those of claim 5 (which claim 5 depends on claim 1), Claims 8 and 9 are thus similarly rejected with the rationales applied against claim 5.

e. As per claims 11-14:

- i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of claims 5 and 8 therefore they are similarly rejected with the same reasons against those claims.

f. As per claim 15:

- i. This claim has limitations that are similar to those of claims 11 and 13, therefore it is similarly rejected with the same reasons applied against those claims.

g. As per claim 16:

- i. A combination
 - (1) of:
 - (a) a processor,
 - (b) a system memory,
 - (c) a web browser and
 - (d) an authentication data displaying routine

Art Unit: 2135

- (2) is inherent in existing client computers.
 - ii. With regard to the constituents of the displaying routine:
 - (1) The constituents of this displaying routine are similar to those of claim 15. Therefore they have been addressed.
 - iii. This claim is thus rejected with the same reasons applied against claim 15.
- 6. Claims 17, 18, and 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alegre (et al (6,199,113 hereinafter Alegre) in view of Doeberl et al (6,237,033 hereinafter Doeberl).
 - a. As to claim 17:
 - i. With the above problem of indefiniteness for rejecting claim 17 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, claim 17 is interpreted as follow:
 - (1) 17. A method
 - (a) for displaying web browser cookie data,
 - (b) comprising the steps of:
 - (i) having a user logged onto a targeted domain and path on a server, and
 - (ii) displaying,
 - 1) after having the user connected [i.e., logged onto a domain and path which the

user sought access]

- 2) on a web browser frame,
- 3) the web browser cookie data,
 - a) which browser cookie data:
 - i) indicates that the web browser has sent a cookie (which are for a targeted domain and path) to the server and so
 - ii) which displaying of that browser cookie data indicates that the browser does such sending.

ii. Preliminary considerations for claim 17:

- (1) Since it is notoriously old and well known in the art that when (if so set) a browser communicates, in behalf of a user, through a server in order to access a domain/path, the browser also sends a cookie for that domain/path to the server, the limitation “the cookie data the web browser sent a cookie to the server for the targeted domain and path” is not of applicant’s invention, but rather simply a part of a definition of what a cookie is and such definition is well known in the art.
- (2) Since it is notoriously old and well known in the art that when a

browser's displaying of information/data/images/pages in a format of web browser frame is not new in the art, so where (or rather in what format) a browser displays a displaying is actually not new.

iii. With the above preliminary considerations for claim 17, the claim 17 is best understood and addressed as follow:

(1) A method which is

(a) for displaying

(i) a cookie

(ii) by a browser and

(iii) on a frame,

(iv) which displaying

1) of the cookie (i.e., the first given information)

2) indicates that

a) the browser has sent such cookie

(which has been made for the user's

computer relative to a targeted

domain/path and stored in the user's

computer so that the browser can

retrieve and send it to the targeted

domain/path whenever the user seek

access to that targeted domain/path)

to the such targeted domain/path

through a server which support such
targeted domain/path.

- (2) Alegre et al (6,199,113 hereinafter Alegre) teaches:
 - (a) A method [performed by his browser 314] which is:
 - (i) for displaying [on display 310 those items that can be displayed]; and
 - (ii) comprising:
 - 1) a step which is
 - a) for displaying [on display 310]
 - i) a given information [322].
- (3) However Alegre et al does not explicitly teach:
 - (a) that the given information displayed by his method displaying step is to:
 - (i) indicate that his browser has sent a cookie to a server
 - (ii) since Alegre store such cookie [324] into memory 318, rather to output it onto his display 310.
- (4) Doeberl et al (6,237,033 hereinafter Doeberl) teaches:
 - (a) displaying cookies by using a browser – [see for examples, Doeberl's Abstract; Detailed Description, paragraphs 6 and 18 ; (see furthermore that Bourdreau et al (5,8325,092) teaches a browser that get cookies for information to be displayed (Detailed Description, paragraph 27-29)] .

(5) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(a) display a cookie such as that of Alegre, which cookie is sent by a browser to a server for web sites that a user would want to visit in order to be permitted for such visitation (if so set as rule for permitting web site visiting) as it is the purpose for which cookies such as that of Alegre are formed and provided in a digital information processing network.

(6) The skilled person would have been motivated to do such displaying of cookie of Alegre in Alegre's display because:

(a) Doeberl teaches the displaying information on cookie allow a user to see [col. 6, lines 60-61] the cookie and so manage [alter or block] it.

b. As per claim 18:

i. Claim 18 claims:

(1) 18. The method as described in Claim 17 wherein the given first information includes a cookie icon.

ii. Official notice is hereby taken that presenting information in an icon is notoriously old and well known in the art.

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

- (1) present the information (such as that which indicate that a cookie such as that of Elegre has been sent to a server) in an icon format [in view of computer graphic icon art] and display the icon in behalf of the information itself.
 - iv. The skill person would have been motivated to present information in icon format because it is a common practice in the art and such presentation is more compact (and that it saves screen space in order for displaying other information that is needed).
- c. As per claim 33:
- i. Claim 33 claims:
 - (1) 33. A computer program product
 - (a) in a computer-readable medium
 - (b) comprising:
 - (i) means
 - 1) responsive to a user
 - 2) connecting to a targeted domain and path on a server
 - 3) for displaying
 - a) given first information
 - i) on a web browser frame,

Art Unit: 2135

- ii) the given first information
indicating
- iii) that the web browser sent a
cookie to the server for the
targeted domain and path;
and

(ii) means

- 1) operative
 - a) in a current web browser session
- 2) for displaying
 - a) a list of cookies sent to the server
for the targeted domain and path.

ii. With the above preliminary matters presented as problem of indefiniteness in the rationale for rejecting claim 33 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, claim 33 is thus interpreted as:

(1) 33. A computer program product:

- (a) in a computer-readable medium and
- (b) comprising:

(i) means

- 1) responsive to a user
- 2) connecting to a targeted domain and path on
a server

- 3) for displaying
 - a) on a web browser frame
 - b) a given first information
 - i) the given first information indicating that the web browser sent a cookie to the server for the targeted domain and path; and

(ii) means

- 1) operative in a current web browser session
- 2) for displaying
 - a) a list of cookies
 - i) sent to the server
 - ii) for the targeted domain and path.

iii. Preliminary considerations for the means listed first in the claim:

- a)
- (b) Since it is not clear as to what is that which is connected to both of the targeted domain and the path, the phrase “a user connecting to a targeted domain and path on a server” will be read as “a user”.
- (c) Since displaying data/information/images on a web browser

frame is notoriously old and well known in the art, the phrase “displaying given first information on a web browser frame” will be read as “displaying given first information” (without the prepositional phrase “on a web browser frame”) – [see to it that Miller et al 6,292,837 teaches displaying information on frame (for technical aspect of how information can be displayed on frame even though the applicant’s claim does not state how the information can be displayed on frame, but rather vaguely state it simply as displaying on a frame)].

(d) Since computer network program product in a medium is ought to be connected to a node in which it is executed and the node is connected to a targeted domain and path on a server and thus all network items are connected to one another (directly and/or indirectly), the limitation the “means responsive to a user connecting to a targeted domain and path on a server” will be read simply as “means responsive to a user”

(e) Since information is used to indicate certain thing and/or event and the meaning of it depend on how one defines and uses it, the object being displayed by the means that is

responsive to the user is simply be read as “given first information,” (without the phrase “the given first information indicating that the web browser sent a cookie to the server for the targeted domain and path”).

- (i) How a person would want to define certain term/condition/event is of one’s mental choice, rather than novel technical aspect that deserves patent rights and protections.

iv. Preliminary considerations for the means listed second in the claim:

- (1) With regard to where the means for displaying a list of cookies is operating:
 - (a) Since means for displaying (i.e., instruction code means for causing a computer to display) is in one way or another is responsive to a user of the program/software/routine/module in which the instruction code/means is written (for example, the user has to turn on a computer and/or trigger certain application to cause the program/software/routine/module to be executed), the phrase “means responsive to a user” will simply read as “means”.

- (b) Technically, the means for displaying is understood to be just an instruction code/means for displaying item(s) that is wished to be displayed for showing – [instruction code means for a browser to display certain items/codes/data/pages/frames on a screen is notoriously old and well known in the art and can be readily available for use if needed]. Instruction code means for causing a computer to display certain item(s) are instruction code that can be written if not available yet (or cut and pasted if so available) into a software/routine/program/module. A current web browser session is a course of using a browser that is being on use for communicating in a network, which browser is a software/routine/program/module. Writing/copying/pasting an instruction code into a web browser is within the knowledge of a person having ordinary skill in the art.

- (2) With regard to the phrase “a list of cookies sent to the server”:

- (a) Since it appears that a list of cookies is a list of cookies, what has been done to the list of cookies appears to have no effect on the means for displaying that list of cookies, the clause “means for
- (i) The relationship between the list and the sending of

it to the server has no clear effect on the role of instruction code/means.

- (b) The both of phrases “sent to the server” and “for the targeted domain and path” do not clarify the meaning of the means, but rather describe what the list of cookies is.
 - (i) Since the effect of the sending of the list of the cookies to the server on the means for displaying is not clear, the “means for displaying a list of cookies sent to the server for the targeted domain and path” is simply read a “means for displaying a list of cookies.”
 - (ii) Since the domain and path for which the list of cookies is appear to have no effect on the means and how the displaying of the list of cookies is displayed and of course sending certain cookies to certain targeted domain and path is of the art rather than applicant’s invention [see for example that sending cookies between browsers and server is of Killian (6,428,392, Detailed Description, paragraphs 5, 6 and 7)], the phrase “a list of cookies ... for the targeted domain and path” is read simply as “a list of cookies” (without the prepositional phrase “for the targeted domain and path”).

- v. With the above preliminary considerations, claim 33 is rephrased and addressed with following attempt:

- (1) 33. A computer program product that is:
- (a) in a computer-readable medium; and
 - (b) comprising:
 - (i) means
 - 1) for displaying
 - a) a given information; and
 - (ii) means
 - 1) for displaying
 - a) a list of cookies.
- (2) Alegre et al (6,199,113 hereinafter Alegre) teaches:
- (a) A computer program product [browser 314]
 - (i) [which is inherently stored] in a computer-readable medium ; and
 - (ii) comprising:
 - 1) [inherent] means
 - a) for displaying [on display 310]
 - i) a given information [322].
- (3) However Alegre et al does not explicitly teach:

- (a) that his computer program product [314] comprises
 - (i) means for displaying a list [324] of cookies.
 - (b) since Alegre has an inherent instruction code means that cause his computer to store such list [324] of cookies into memory 318, rather to output it onto his display 310.
- (4) Doeberl et al (6,237,033 hereinafter Doeberl) teaches:
- (a) displaying cookies by using a browser – [see for examples, Doeberl's Abstract; Detailed Description, paragraphs 6 and 18 ; (see furthermore that Bourdreau et al (5,8325,092) teaches a browser that get cookies for information to be displayed (Detailed Description, paragraph 27-29)] .
- (5) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:
- (a) display a list [324] of cookies such as that of Alegre, which cookies are sent by a browser to a server for web sites that a user would want to visit in order to be permitted for such visitation (if so set as rule for permitting web site visiting) as it is the purpose for which cookies such as that of Alegre are formed and provided in a digital information processing network.
- (6) The skilled person would have been motivated to do such displaying of cookies of Alegre in Alegre's display because:
- (a) Doeberl teaches the displaying information on cookies

allow a user to see [col. 6, lines 60-61] them and so
manage [alter or block] them.

d. As per claims 34-37:

i. These claims claim:

- (1) 34-37/33. The computer program product as described in Claim 33
further including
- (a) 34. means for modifying a cookie identified in the list;
 - (b) 35. means for deleting a cookie identified in the list;
 - (c) 36. means for setting a cookie in the list as blocked; or
 - (d) 37. means for setting a cookie in the list as unblocked.

ii. Doeberl teaches :

- (1) that his browser display a cookie so a user can then:
- (a) inspect the cookie,
 - (b) alter it -- [this indicates that there is an inherent means in Doeberl's system for modifying an identified cookie] or
 - (c) block/unblock it --[this indicates that there is an inherent means in Doeberl's system for blocking/unblocking a cookie.

7. Claims 25, 26, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Art Unit: 2135

Doeberl et al (6,237,033 hereinafter Doeberl).

a. As per claim 25:

i. Doeberl teaches:

(1) a method of browsing websites using cookie data which method including the steps of:

- (a) browser's retrieving the cookie data for web-site and
- (b) browser's sending the cookie data.

ii. It is inherent

(1) that Doeberl's retrieving step includes

- (a) determining if a web-site's cookie is blocked/unblocked

(2) because Doeberl teaches block/unblock [col. 6, line 60] cookie, which cookie would be usable if so blocked.

iii. However Doeberl does not explicitly teach:

(1) this retrieving includes:

- (a) determining whether the web-site is associated with a cookie.

iv. With regard to the limitation "if the entry is marked in the table as unblocked":

- (1) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the memory access control art at the time the invention was made to know that it is a common practice in the art:
 - (a) to mark a piece of data/information/file in a memory/storage as blocked/unblocked/available/unavailable/retrievable/unretrievable, and
 - (b) to have a memory access routine checks for such marking so as to determine whether the data/information/file is readable/retrievable, and act according to such mark (i.e., to retrieve or not to retrieve such data/information/file).
- (2) The skilled person would have been motivated to have his/her memory access routine to check for such mark and act according to whether the mark allows or not allow to retrieve or to forfeit the retrieval because it is a common practice in the art:
- (3) With regard to the specific type of data being blocked/unblocked (i.e., a URL/cookie data being blocked/unblocked):
 - (a) Doeberl et al (US patent 6,237,033 (issued January 13, 1999) hereinafter referred to as Doeberl) teaches:
 - (i) More browsers today can give a user an option of blocking a cookie [see col. 2, lines 1-13].
- (4) With the teaching as such of Doeberl, the skilled person would have been motivated to block/unblock a cookie.

Art Unit: 2135

v. Official notice is also hereby taken

(1) that:

(a) requiring

(i) the following for sending (for making available for usage of) cookie data

1) checking to determine whether a table (such as an access control list (ACL) listing the permitted/non-permitted URLs) lists the URL being attempted to be retrieved) ;

2) if so determined as listed, retrieving data (including cookie data) associated with the URL; and

3) sending the cookie and the URL to a server,

(ii) is old and well known feature of known web browsers.

vi. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize that:

(1) when a user attempt to visit a web-site using an existing browser the implement cookie mechanism , the such browser would make sure whether a cookie list includes a cookie for that particular web-site (since the web-site require visitor to have cookie and have its server set the cookie in the client's computer).

vii. The skilled person would have realized such feature of a browser because such cookie mechanism is intrinsic in most existing browsers.

b. As per claim 26:

- i. prompting a user to reject/accept a new cookie is notoriously old and well known in the art and has been admitted as such by the applicant.
- ii. Doeberl teaches that the user can inspect the cookie alter it or block it

c. As per claims 38 and 39:

- i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of claim 25-26 and thus are rejected with the same rationale applied thereto.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ly V. Hua whose telephone number is (703) 305-9684. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vu Kim can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2135

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Ly V. Hua
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2135

Lvh
February 8, 2004